CASE No.: 3:07-cv-05944-SC

MDL No.: 1917

Case 4:07-cv-05944-JST Document 2971-45 Filed 11/07/14 Page 1 of 3

[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING HITACHI'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT BASED UPON WITHDRAWAL AND STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS

28

## Case 4:07-cv-05944-JST Document 2971-45 Filed 11/07/14 Page 2 of 3

1	Interbond Corporation of America, d/b/a
2	BrandsMart USA v. Hitachi, et al., No. 3:11-cv-06275-SC;
3	Office Depot, Inc. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al., No. 3:11-cv-06276-SC;
4	
5	CompuCom Systems, Inc. v. Hitachi, Ltd.,
6	et al., No. 3:11-cv-06396-SC;
7	Costco Wholesale Corporation v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al., No. 3:11-cv-06397-SC;
8	P.C. Richard & Son Long Island Corporation, et
9	al. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al., No. 3:12-cv-02648-SC;
10	Schultze Agency Services, LLC on behalf of Tweeter OPCO, LLC and Tweeter Newco, LLC v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al., No. 3:12-cv-02649-SC;
11	
12	Tech Data Corporation, et al. v. Hitachi,
13	Ltd., et al., No. 3:13-cv-00157-SC
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

CASE No.: 3:07-cv-05944-SC

MDL No.: 1917

After full consideration of the evidence, briefs and authorities, and oral argument of counsel, 1 2 the Court finds that there is no triable issue of material fact as to the causes of action asserted in the 3 operative complaints of the Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and each of the Direct Action Plaintiffs in 4 the above-captioned cases as to Hitachi, Ltd. ("HTL"), Hitachi Displays, Ltd. ("HDP"), Hitachi Asia, Ltd. ("HAS"), Hitachi America, Ltd. ("HAL") and Hitachi Electronic Devices (USA), Inc. 5 ("HED(US)") (collectively, the "Hitachi Defendants"). The Hitachi Defendants are therefore 6 7 entitled to judgment as a matter of law. IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Hitachi Defendants' Motion For Summary Judgment 8 9 Based Upon Withdrawal And The Statutes of Limitations is GRANTED: The Hitachi Defendants are not subject to liability for any acts in furtherance of the 10 1) 11 alleged conspiracy after March 20, 2003, when the Hitachi Defendants exited the CRT industry and 12 therefore withdrew from the alleged conspiracy. 2) With the exception of claims under Wisconsin and Vermont law, all claims of the 13 14 Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and each of the Direct Action Plaintiffs in the above-captioned cases 15 against the Hitachi Defendants are barred in their entirety by the applicable statutes of limitations 16 and are dismissed because they were filed more than four years after the Hitachi Defendants exited the CRT industry and withdrew from the alleged conspiracy. With respect to the state-law claims 17 under Wisconsin and Vermont law, which are subject to six-year statutes of limitations, all such 18 19 claims arising outside the limitations period are barred and dismissed. 20 IT IS SO ORDERED. 21 22 23 Dated: Hon. Samuel Conti 24 United States District Judge 25 26

[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING HITACHI'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT BASED UPON WITHDRAWAL AND STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS

27

28

CASE No.: 3:07-cv-05944-SC MDL No.: 1917